DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 662 CE 025 086

AUTHOR	Spooner, Kendrick L.
TITLE	A Survey of Four-Year Colleges' and Universities' Graduate Follow-Up Processes.
INSTITUTION	Center for Education and Management, Inc., Kersey, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	Colorado State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, Denver.
PUB DATE	31 Aug 79
CONTRACT	CF460147
NOTE	49p.; The appended survey form will not reproduce well.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Comparative Analysis; Differences; *Followup Studies; *Graduate Surveys; *Higher Education; *Methods; *Outcomes of Education; *State Surveys; Systems Analysis; Vocational Followup

ABSTRACT

A survey of four-year colleges' and universities' graduate follow-up procedures was conducted to (1) establish what type of follow-up systems are used, (2) determine what commitment the administration of the institutions has to implementing a graduate follow-up system, (3) determine to what extent the institutions are planning changes in their student follow-up practice, (4) determine how current data are collected, and (5) determine how helpful a centralized graduate follow-up system would be to various colleges and universities. An on-site survey and interviews of various professional staff at each institution revealed that there were three basic types of systems identified. The first of these systems were the follow-up systems developed by the institutional research or placement divisions that collected information pertaining to occupational title and student major. The second type was the graduate follow-up completed by the department or schools with an institution that primarily impacted on program improvement and program evaluation. The third type of follow-up study was the ad hoc study completed by some institutions. (Summaries of the interviews at each institution are included, and the survey instruments are appended.) (LRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED186662

A SURVEY OF FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES' GRADUATE FOLLOW-UP PROCESSES

By

Kendrick L. Spooner, Ed.D.
Center for Education and Management, Inc.

Prepared for the
Colorado State Occupational Information
Coordinating Committee

(SOICC)

August 31, 1979

CE 025 088

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Warren W. Wolff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PREFACE

This study was conducted and the report written by Kendrick L. Spooner, Ed.D., President, Center for Education and Management, Inc., under contract from the Colorado SOICC.

Funding for conduct of this study was obtained from the Colorado SOICC, FY 1979 budget, as approved by the Committee in the SOICC's Annual Plan under Contract #CF460147, State of Colorado.

Although the purposes for conducting this survey are listed in the Executive Abstract and in the Introduction section of the full report, it is important, in order to place the study in its proper perspective, to consider the need for the study in the context of the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee's and the SOICC's mandates:

> "(1) To improve coordination between, and communication among, the producers and users of occupational information.
>
> (2) To develop and implement an occupational information system which ' . . . shall include data on occupational demand and supply based on uniform definitions, standardized estimating procedures, and standardized occupational classifications.'"
>
> Education Amendments, 1976
> P.L. 94-162

In keeping with these mandates, it is necessary for agencies who are providing education and training services with public funds to be accountable concerning the impact of their service on the persons they educate and train. One impact of the service is the extent to which persons who have received education and training are able to enter productive careers in the world of work. Although the mission of the four-year college or university is, and certainly should be, more broadly defined in terms of acquisition of knowledge and skills which prepare persons to better meet the challenges of life, in general, it can not be denied that one defensible measure of the effectiveness of an institution of higher learning is the extent to which persons who receive its services are able to enter their desired employment.

In view of SOICC's mandate to assist in identifying the supply and demand for occupations, it is important for institutions of higher education to be aware of the occupations which are entered by their graduates. As a major source of supply for workers to occupations in our society, it is imperative that more be known about graduates and other trained persons after leaving institutions of higher education. Indeed, without

knowing the percent of graduates entering various occupations, it is impossible to verify the supply of labor to occupations for which a college education is usually the preparation.

Further, it is important to provide to current students in these institutions information concerning the types of occupations which persons with identical or similar majors may enter. This information is very helpful to students who are exploring careers or who are considering the selection of academic majors.

It is the SOICC's contention that such information should not only be available for vocational education, CETA, vocational rehabilitation, and other education and training programs conducted in the state but should also be available for those trained in our four-year colleges and universities. It is hoped that this survey is a first step toward obtaining follow-up of students in occupations from Colorado's institutions of higher education.

EXECUTIVE ABSTRACT OF SURVEY OF FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES' AND UNIVERSITIES' GRADUATE FOLLOW-UP PROCESSES

A survey of four-year colleges' and universities' graduate follow-up procedures was conducted as part of the Colorado State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee's scope of work for 1979. The purpose of the survey was to: 1) establish what type of follow-up systems are used by various higher education institutions in Colorado; 2) determine what committment the administration of the institutions has to implementing a graduate follow-up system; 3) determine to what extent the institutions are planning changes in their student follow-up practice; 4) determine how current data are collected by higher education institutions and to what extent it could be used to enhance the supply data compiled by SOICC; and 5) determine how helpful a centralized graduate follow-up system would be to various colleges and universities. These purposes were achieved through an on-site survey and interviews of various professional staff at each institution.

It was found that there were three basic types of systems identified. First, and most useful were the follow-up systems developed by the Institutional Research or Placement Divisions that collected information pertaining to occupational title and student major. The most sophisticated systems were at Metropolitan State College and the University of Colorado at Boulder. The second type was the graduate follow-up completed by the departments or schools within an institution that primarily impacted on program improvement and program evaluation. Generally these surveys were conducted on a less regular basis and with smaller groups of students. The third type of follow-up study was the ad hoc study completed by some institutions. These studies were on an

irregular basis and had varing purposes.

It was found that most institutions in Colorado were commited to graduate follow-up. However, there were differences in the type and quantity of data collected from various surveys.

The Evaluator does feel that adequate cooperation exists in the field, so as to implement some type of student follow-up precedures that would supply SOICC with the needed occupational title information for the Colorado institutions. It would seem that a generalizable system does not appear to be feasible. Because of the different purposes and different amounts of resources available at the various institutions. It was found by the Evaluator that if the SOICC wished to obtain information about higher education graduates, that the following procedure might be used: 1) Review the present questionnaires for data pertaining to the supply matrix. Institutions that appear to have data are Metropolitan State College, University of Colorado at Boulder, University of Northern Colorado, Mesa College, Western State College, Adams State College and the University of Southern Colorado. 2) Provide a forum so that each school or college interested in being involved in a student follow-up system can discuss concerns, needs and desires for graduate follow-up with the SOICC Director and with their counterparts from other institutions. 3) Provide technical consultation to institutions wishing to develop their own student follow-up systems with the understanding that the occupational information needed by SOICC will be included as part of the questionnaire and shared with SOICC once collected. 4) To do a follow-up study of students from the University of Colorado at Denver, the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, Colorado School

of Mines and possibly Colorado State University to supply adequate supply data to SOICC. It is felt that with a combination of these suggested activities, SOICC could obtain adequate in-state supply information related to the four-year higher education institutions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS	3
Western State College	3
Adams State College	5
University of Denver	10
Colorado State University	10
University of Colorado at Denver	13
Ft. Lewis College	15
University of Southern Colorado	15
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs	17
Mesa College	17
Colorado School of Mines	18
University of Colorado at Boulder	19
Metro State College	22
University of Northern Colorado	24
SUMMARY	28
Types of Systems	30
Commitment to Graduate Follow-up	31
Future Direction	31
Enhancement of Supply Data	32
Development of Generalizable System	32
Recommendations	33

A SURVEY OF FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES' GRADUATE FOLLOW-UP PROCESSES

Introduction

A survey of four-year colleges' and universities' graduate follow-up procedure was conducted as part of the Colorado State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees' (SOICC) scope of work for 1979.

The purpose of the survey was to establish 1) what type of follow-up systems are used in various higher education institutions in Colorado, 2) what commitment does the administration of these institutions have to implementing graduate follow-up systems, 3) to what extent are the institutions planning changes in their student follow-up practices, 4) how current data are collected by higher education institutions and to what extent could it be used to enhance the supply data compiled by SOICC, and 5) how helpful a centralized graduate follow-up system might be to the various colleges and unuversities. These purposes were achieved through an on-site survey and interview of various professional staff at each institution.

The Center for Education and Management scheduled and conducted thirteen interviews with twelve public four-year institutions and one private four-year institution. The institutions involved in the study were Adams State College, Mesa College, the Univeristy of Colorado at Colorado Springs, Ft. Lewis College, the University of Colorado at Denver, Colorado State University, the University of Denver, the University of Colorado at Boulder, Metro State College, Colorado School of Mines, the University of Southern Colorado, the University of Northern Colorado and Western State College.

The staff from the Center for Education and Management interviewed at least one individual at each institution. There were several institutions

where four or five individuals were interviewed because of the diversity of the student follow-up systems.

The reader can find the interview protocol used for the study in Attachment 1. The remainder of this report will provide the reader with brief summaries of each interview and conclude with a summary and recommendations section.

Summary of Interviews

Western State College

The interviewer visited Gunnison, Colorado, July 23, 1979. Two individuals were extensively interviewed, and several other administrators at the college contributed information in informal discussion. The primary contributor of information was Mr. David Berilla, Placement Coordinator for the college. Mr. Berilla supervises a systematic student follow-up of all graduates from the college. He stated that the primary purpose of the follow-up is to establish the institution's success in job placement. Secondly, the data is used to supply information for state required reports and to provide jobs and manpower projection information for the central administration.

A major effort is made to identify the graduates' current addresses. Mr. Berilla does what he calls cap and gown survey at graduation time, where he asks each student to supply name, address, city, state, phone number and some other pertinent information to him upon graduation. Further names and addresses are cross-validated with the alumni files. Any individual addresses that aren't obtained from either the cap and gown survey or the alumni files are obtained from the registrar's office, in terms of the last permanent current address provided prior to graduation. Students' majors are identified by program area, and specific job titles are collected but not coded or otherwise used. The response rate for the last year's follow-up was approximately 60%. The instrument used is primarily one developed by the Western State Placement Office.

In terms of developing the data into reports, all processing is done by hand. The report is basically a summary of the statistics and is made available to the President, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Vice-

President for Student Affairs, published in the newspaper, and made available to other faculty and staff upon request. The information contained in the follow-up report is used to develop the President's annual report, the Vice-President's Student Services Annual report, and the NEA report to the State Department of Education. Names and addresses obtained from the survey are provided to the alumni office. Mr. Berilla stated that the information contained in the report is not used extensively for decision making.

The primary resources utilized for the survey are Mr. Berilla's professional time, the staff time at the placement center, and the postage and printing necessary to develop and mail the questionnaires.

The Division Chairpersons of the seven units at Western State were polled to see if any of the divisions conducted a systematic or other type of graduate follow-up. It was learned that six of the seven divisions did not conduct any sort of student follow-up. One unit, the Division of Education, did conduct a follow-up to supply names and addresses to the Colorado Department of Education and further to complete the CCHE's reporting requirement. Also, the information obtained from their follow-up procedures was used for internal purposes. However, it was found that most of the information obtained in the follow-up study was obtained from Mr. Berilla's follow-up report. The remainder of the information was obtained through circulating a form to the Education faculty and having them supply what information they could about each of the graduating students. The Education Division does do its own follow-up of graduates every third year.

The future direction of student follow-up at Western State appears to be rather stable, in that Mr. Berilla feels that he has a workable system and will continue to utilize that system, at least, through a five year cycle.

At the end of a five-year cycle he plans to do a five-year follow-up to gain further information about Western State's graduates. He stated, further, that at that time he would consider making revisions to the questionnaire.

Mr. Berilla stated that he would be willing to cooperate with SOICC, other individuals, or agencies interested in doing a generalizable or uniform student follow-up for all state institutions. He did express some concerns about the reliability and validity of the data obtained through a general system, and also pointed out that there may be a credibility problem, regardless of the extent of accuracy of the data. A last point of concern was, he felt, this kind of information could be misused by state agencies or the JBC, for budgeting purposes. Mr. Berilla stated that at the present time the institution would be willing to cooperate with SOICC by supplying names and addresses or clerical assistance, to the extent that the present system uses the clerical assistance. He also stated that the University would be happy to share the information obtained through the present system. The bottom line, in terms of their commitment to cooperate, is dollars. It was quite clear that Western State could not commit additional resources, beyond those already utilized for the present follow-up system, to a new joint effort. The following may be found in the Technical Appendix: 1) Graduate follow-up questionnaire and cover letter and reports of findings for the 1973 and 1977 follow-ups 2) Cap and gown survey form 3) Alumni address file cards.

Adams State College

Three interviews were conducted on July 25, 1979, with the Placement Director, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the Department Chairman for the Division of Education. The following is a summary of those interviews.

The Graduate School sends a follow-up questionnaire to each Master of Arts graduate. The purpose of the questionnaire is to provide information

for program improvement. The survey includes all MA graduates for the preceding year. The survey is done in the fall of the year, and, in the last survey completed, the Graduate Dean received 63.9% returns. Students' majors are coded by department. There is no occupational title information collected. The survey was developed by the Graduate Dean and is operated from his administrative budget; no additional resources are allocated for the follow-up study. The Graduate Dean stated that he didn't do an employer follow-up; the report developed is a tally of comments from the questionnaire. These comments are sent to Division Chairpersons for their use for program improvement. Also, the results of the questionnaire are summarized for the Graduate Dean's Annual Report to the President. The Graduate Dean stated that he has no future plans for modifying the follow-up system. He stated that he has utilized the same instrument for five years and that in order to get a good look across time, it is necessary to maintain some consistency. When asked about his willingness to cooperate in the development and utilization of a generalizable or uniform system, he said he would be willing to cooperate if the system was of value to them at Adams State College. However, he cautioned the interviewer that if the system were employed by the state agencies to gain uniformity at the expense of usefulness, then his answer would be no. He stated that he would willingly cooperate with SOICC by supplying names and addresses and by sharing existing data. He also stated that all other resources were in short supply and that any committment of additional resources to a student follow-up would be unlikely.

The second interview was with the Division Chairperson for Education. The Division of Education does student follow-up on a three-year basis. The purpose for the follow-up is to provide the departments with program

evaluation data and to address local program planning. Both students and employers received questionnaries. The Division of Education cooperates with the State Department of Education in the state wide follow-up of teachers (first and third year teachers). The type of informaiton collected related to teaching occupations, grade level, subject area, etc. Also, geographic information is collected, but is not used. The employer follow-up is sent to the building principal of each graduate. This information is tallied and also used for program imporvement. All data is compiled by hand. Three reports are developed from the information: the Division's Annual Report to the President, which is used for accountability purposes; the report to Colorado Department of Education, which is used for accrediting purposes; and the report of the data to the departments for use in program improvement and planning. The Division Chairperson cooperates extensively with the Placement Office and the Registrar in identifying students and processing information. The Chairperson sees some modifications in the follow-up instrument may be needed in the future, in that there is a trend towards developing instrumentation that more closely relates to the program objectives. Also, the Chairman stated that he sees a need to develop an instrument that is more compatible with the Colorado Department of Education Survey, so that results can be cross-compared for validity and reliability. The Chairperson stated that the Division of Education would be willing to cooperate on a systematic effort, but at this point he does not see where that effort could be much different from the systematic effort already underway by the Colorado Department of Education. His qualifier was that they would be willing to cooperate as long as it was of value to them. When asked in what areas they could contribute resources, it was stated that they could supply names and

addresses of graduates and that they would be willing to share existing data. Further, it was stated that the kinds of help they would need would be data processing services and an institutional researcher to aid in the development of their study.

The third interview was with the Director of Placement. The Placement Office does a follow-up each year: first, in May; later, in August, for the non-respondents. The Director stated they receive approximately 75% return of the questionnaires. The purpose for their survey is to establish the institution's success in placement and to provide information to the Central Administration. Other purposes for the survey are to supply information for state reports and to supply departments with data for program planning. The Placement Officer stated he kept track of the students through the Placement files and the alumni office. For those students not on file in either of those offices, the Placement Officer used the last address recorded in the Registrar's office. The survey form is highly directed toward teacher education; however, there are provisions for non-teachers to respond. The questionnaire does ask the individual to identify the type of work but does not ask for the company. Also, the questionnaire collects information about geographic location of graduates. The questionnaire is a fill-in-the-blank type of instrument with no special codings for occupational titles or geographical area. Also, the Placement Director sends out a short evaluation form to the employers of graduates, along with the placement credentials. The basic information the employer supplies is the type of position the individual was hired to fill and the salary at which he was hired. All data collected is processed by hand; several reports are generated from the information. First, an Annual Report to the Dean of

Student Affairs contains a summary of the data. Secondly, the TS and D, Form Two Report for the State Department of Education is completed, utilizing the placement follow-up information. Also, a report is sent to the Academic Vice-President indicating placement success, and the information is also used to fill out various state and federal forms relating to minority placements and other types of requested information. The resources utilized for the system are basically the Placement Director, his secretary, and work-study students; there is no specific budget set aside for doing the placement follow-up. When asked about the future directions for the placement study, the director stated he would like to develop a computerized system but, at this time, did not have the expertise available to him. Further, he stated that he would be willing to cooperate with the SOICC in doing a more generalizable or uniform type of student follow-up across the state. He would be interested in seeing Adam State's results compared to those of other institutions. Further, he stated that they would be willing to supply names and addresses of graduates in support of such a system. Further, they could supply some work-study assistance and could supply processing for a standardized questionnaire, if someone else would design the system. They would share existing data and provide some technical expertise in management (as available from the present staff). In general, the administration and faculty interviewed at Adams State College were positive toward a more generalizable system. However, as in other institutions, it appears that the qualification is that the information collected must be of value to Adams State. Furthermore, each individual interviewed expressed a concern about the length of an uniform questionnaire. All questionnaires collected were one to two pages long. Each individual stated that their

response rate increased as they shortened their questionnaire. The following may be found in the Technical Appendix: 1) Credential request form 2) Placement form 3) Employer's evaluation of graduates' questionnaire, cover letter and report of results from the follow-up 4) Questionnaire for graduates, cover letter and report by Graduate School 5) Teacher education follow-up questionnaire.

University of Denver

The University of Denver had a systematic student follow-up that was operated out of the placement office. The major purpose of the follow-up was to establish the institution's success in placement. This follow-up system attempted to include all graduates. A survey form is sent out approximately six weeks after graduation and one follow-up to non-respondents is sent out two months after graduation. The response rate for the survey is about 20%. The information collected does ask for job title, name of employer, and does provide some indication of location; also, institutional major is collected. This information is hand-processed and made a part of the placement center's annual report. No formal report is developed for general dissemination. DU does have plans to revise the follow-up system. However, at this time any work on improving the follow-up system will await the installation of the new Vice President for Academic Affairs. It was stated that DU would be interested in cooperating with SOICC or other agencies in developing a follow-up system, but that any committment would be dependent upon cost and direct benefit to the institution.

Colorado State University

The Placement Coordinator and Vice-President of Student Affairs were interviewed at Colorado State University. Colorado State University's system of student follow-up consisted of individual efforts from each of the nine colleges. There was no centralized student follow-up effort. In general, the major purposes of the individual system were to provide each college with program evaluation information and to investigate the

patterns of jobs graduates have taken. The Central Placement Coordinator does provide services to students in terms of having a central location for student data sheets and resumes for employers to review. Also, the central office provides areas for on-campus employer interviews. There have been some efforts to provide career development services to the students, such as writing resumes, job interviewing, etc. The nine colleges at CSU each do their own follow-up. Two colleges use a mail questionnaire. The College of Natural Science does a one, five, and ten year follow-up, primarily to evaluate the programs. All the departments utilize the same survey and each department provides its own cover letter. Each department in the College of Professional Studies (the departments of Education, Physical Education, and Vocational Education) completes a survey each year. The Department of Education survey is in cooperation with the State Department of Education.

In the College of Home Economics, the Department of Food Science Nutrition does a student follow-up that collects occupational information. In the College of Forestry and Natural Science each department participates in a general survey for the college. The College of Engineering does a survey about every four years. This survey is rather extensive (the last survey mailed a 33 page questionnaire). The College of Engineering generally takes an instrument utilized by some other major engineering college so that they can utilize its data as a point of reference.

The College of Business Administration uses a short questionnaire addressing job placement and follow-ups yearly. Individual departments within the College of Business also do follow-ups. The College of Art, Humanities and Social Science has no general policy for student follow-up. Student follow-ups are left to each department. The College of Veterinary

Medicine and Biological Science has a policy that each department will do its own survey. However, the departments are not required to follow-up graduates yearly. The College of Arts and Sciences uses a short survey form to follow-up each graduate yearly; also, each department does some follow-up of their own graduates. The Colorado State University system is very decentralized and the central administration does not provide input into or special resources for the follow-ups. Each college undertakes the follow-up as its own responsibility and designs the questionnaire to meet its own programatic needs.

Asked if they would be interested in a generalizable or uniform system, the administrators stated that they would not consider a general form, in that it would not meet the current needs of the various colleges. Any system adopted must provide the capability for departments to maintain contact with the students. Further, any system would have to be useful to the various departments and colleges and be accepted by them. Further, it was stated that any centralized data collection system must not duplicate the existing types of data collected. When asked in what way they would be willing to cooperate with SOICC in doing a systematic follow-up, the administrator stated that they would probably provide clerical assistance in mailing and coding instruments, depending upon the value of the data to the institution. They could provide facilities for processing the questionnaire and they would share existing manpower data. However, they feel that data required for manpower projections is not available. They stated they would probably not supply names and addresses of graduates without the permission of the student.

The administrators stated some concern about funding or utilization of funds for this particular purpose. They stated, however, that they

were not unwilling to cooperate with SOICC once a specific proposal were drawn up for their reaction. Further, there was a concern about the confidentiality of the information shared and the utilization of the information by other agencies for other than manpower purposes, once such information had been collected.

University of Colorado at Denver

On August 1, 1979 the evaluators interviewed the Director of Research and Planning for the University of Colorado at Denver. It was stated that the University does a systematic follow-up of students. This follow-up is done on a three or four year cycle and includes graduates from a series of years. The first follow-up included years 1970 - 1975; the second follow-up, just recently completed, included graduates from the years 1976 - 1979. The major purposes for the graduate follow-up are to provide central administration with the program evaluation data, to address local programing needs, and to establish the institution's success in job placement. Primary emphasis for the follow-up is for program evaluation purposes. The school utilizes the alumni office to obtain lists of graduates' addresses for each school and college within the university. This list is not complete; therefore, students not listed with the alumni office are not included in the follow-up.

The follow-up studies collect data by major; the major is coded and could be transferred to a Hegis code, if advantageous. The follow-up questionnaire does collect information about the first job and the present job; it also includes some geographic and occupational classification data, such as Office Manager, Technician, Professional, Sales, etc.

The school also has done an employer follow-up; however, this has not been on a systematic basis and it is not necessarily of employers of graduates. The intent of the employers follow-up was to get a general notion of what they thought about college graduates and, particularly, what the present employment possibilities were for Arts and Science type graduates.

All data collected in the student follow-up is processed through the SPSS computer package. One report is developed from the information. This report is distributed to the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, the Council of Deans, the Student Government, and others who are interested. This year's report will also be utilized as part of the North Central accrediting report. Also, it is planned to do a longitudinal study by utilizing the data from the first five year study in conjunction with the data in the second five year study. The institution plans to do some minor revisions on the follow-up instrument, and will continue to follow-up students on an every two to three year basis. The institution would be willing to cooperate with SOICC, as long as their system would meet SOICC needs. It was stated that they think a cooperative follow-up effort is an excellent idea and further support the concepts behind what Warren Wolff is doing and would like to cooperate with him. In terms of types of cooperation which seem possible at this time, it was observed that the institution would probably set aside a little money ($50 or $100) in support of an effort like this, but would probably not set aside larger amounts. The institution further would probably not supply names and addresses of graduates. But they would provide clerical assistance for mailing and coding instruments. The university does have a capability for computer processing and would aid in processing a standardized questionnaire. They would definitely share their existing data with

SOICC and would provide technical expertise to help develop and manage a system as time was available. A copy of the survey of graduates' questionnaire may be found in the Technical Appendix.

Ft. Lewis College

There is no systematic follow-up completed at Ft. Lewis. The last time a follow-up was done was in 1972, when 65% of the graduates followed-up returned their instrument. This follow-up consisted of the faculty or department chairmen writing a personal letter to each graduate from the school.

Ft. Lewis plans a student follow-up study for next year. This will include students graduating since the 1972 follow-up. When asked if they would cooperate with SOICC in developing a uniform system, it was stated that they did not know where they would get involved in such a system. Asked if they would supply names and addresses of graduates, it was stated that they perceived they would need the permission of each graduate prior to the release of that information. It was seen that a better alternative for Ft. Lewis was working with the state college system in developing some type of follow-up for the smaller schools. However, it should be noted that working with SOICC in the development of a system was not out of the question.

University of Southern Colorado

University of Southern Colorado does a systematic follow-up with all graduates from their school. The first questionnaire is sent out one semester after graduation, and a second follow-up questionnaire for non-respondents is sent out two semesters after graduation. The major purpose of the follow-up is to provide departments with program evaluation data; also, the survey provides information to establish the institution's

success in placement. The permanent address provided by the student prior to graduation is used in mailing the questionnaire. This address is also utilized for mailing the diploma so that there is some guarantee that it is current.

The institution collects information pertaining to students' majors. The follow-up process is a reoccurring process every year. There was a 66% response rate to last year's student follow-up survey. Information collected related to job placement. Questions such as "who is your employer" and "what is your job title" were asked. The system has been revised recently. There does not seem to be enough funds to computerize this system. Geographic locations are identified through the addresses and zip codes; however, no reporting of geographical locations are provided. All processing for the report is done by hand. The final report is provided to each department and to the administration of the university.

The placement director would like to do a five year follow-up but does not have the funds necessary for completing the study. He has indicated that the University of Southern Colorado would be willing to cooperate with SOICC in the development of a uniform system as long as the system is beneficial and helpful to the school. The kinds of resources the University could provide are clerical assistance for mailing and coding instruments, processing standardized questionnaire returns, share existing data, and to provide technical expertise for follow-up. Also, it was stated that there seems to be no reason why names and addresses of graduates could not be supplied; however, permission from other administrative staff must be obtained prior to the release. A copy of the follow-up questionnaire and the report of findings may be found in the Technical Appendix.

University of Colorado at Colorado Springs

The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs does not do a systematic student follow-up. They did complete a follow-up of their graduates in 1976 and hopefully will institute a systematic follow-up system through the alumni association. The purpose of the follow-up completed was to establish the institution's success in placement.

It was stated that the Colorado Springs campus depended upon the Boulder campus for some of their information. It was also stated that some departments and schools did do student follow-ups on their own. For example, the School of Education did a follow-up in compliance with State Department of Education requirements. Also, the School of Business' M.B.A. program does some type of follow-up.

The placement center sends out a questionnaire to all those utilizing the service. The return last year was about 12½% for this survey. The types of questions asked were "did you get a job in your major field" and a salary question. The only employer follow-up implemented was to follow-up those individual employers utilizing the placement service. A report was developed from placement survey and sent to the administration. Because of the low response rate, very little use was made of the information.

It was stated that the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs would be willing to supply names and addresses of graduates, to provide clerical assistance for mailing and coding instruments, and to share existing information as it is.

Mesa College

The Mesa College placement office does two follow-ups: one for associate degree students and one for baccalaureate students. The system utilized for both surveys is modeled after the State Board for Community Colleges and

Occupational Education Survey. The major purposes for this survey are 1) to supply data for state and federal reports, 2) to provide departments with program evaluation information, and 3) to provide the central administration with program review of data. The placement office utilizes the addresses provided by the students prior to their graduation. The survey is sent approximately three months after the student has left school. The survey collects information pertaining to educational major and job title; however, this information is not coded or reported. The school receives a return of 60 to 70 percent of the questionnaires. Geographical information is collected, but is not coded. No employer follow-up in done.

The data collected through the survey is processed through a computer program and a report is provided to vice presidents and any teacher that in interested. Mesa College sees no need for redesigning their current system. They stated, however, that they would be willing to cooperate with SOICC by providing names and addresses of graduates and by sharing existing data. Further cooperation would depend upon to what extent the system would meet their needs. The following may be found in the Technical Appendix: 1) Graduates with Associate degrees questionnaire 2) Graduates with B.A. degrees questionnaire.

Colorado School of Mines

In interviewing the Director of Placement and Coordinator for Cooperative Education, it was found that Colorado School of Mines does not actively and systematically follow-up their graduates. Instead, they do a salary impact follow-up for those students placed through the Placement Center. Further, it was stated that the College does not see a need at this time to do extensive follow-up. It was pointed out that geographical locations are difficult to pin-point with engineering students, in that they are frequently transferred, and many times they are assigned to more than

one job location. It was stated that the College would cooperate in an effort for an uniform system but would not be able to supply resources for the effort. The names and addresses of graduates would be made available to SOICC or a more current list may be bought from the Alumni Association. Further, they would be willing to share what data they had. It was pointed out that the College does not put resources into graduate follow-up studies.

University of Colorado at Boulder

At the University of Colorado three individuals were interviewed: the Director of Placement and Career Counseling, a staff assistant for the Vice President of Institutional Research, and a staff assistant for the Placement Director. Also, the deans of the College of Arts and Science, the College of Business, and the College of Engineering were interviewed by telephone.

It was found that the only college doing any systematic follow-up was the College of Engineering. The type of information obtained was types of jobs offered, location of jobs, and if the job was taken. The dean stated there was very little specific job title information; further, that the returns were small and, consequently, of limited value. Some departments within other colleges do some student follow-up, but no specific department was identified.

In interviewing the Institutional Research Staff, it was found that a comprehensive student follow-up system was being developed. This system included Freshman follow-up, Senior follow-up, Exiting Student, and Alumni surveys. It was pointed out that these surveys had the primary purpose of providing the Central Administration with program review data. The Exiting Students survey had a primary purpose of identifying why students withdraw from college. A secondary purpose for this survey is to provide the

departments with program evaluation data. All information on students is carried forward from their freshman year. The student information is coded by major, which can be translated to a Hegis code if necessary. The follow-up studies are recurring and are on a one and five year basis. Some minor modifications in the timing of the follow-up have been implemented to prevent following-up of more than two classes of students during any one year; the return rate for last year's survey of graduates was 33%. This survey did collect information pertaining to job placement and it was coded into 22 categories. The current system was developed by the institution, in order to meet their needs. It does identify geographical location, but this information is not specifically coded. This system does not include an employer follow-up. All data is processed by a computer and a series of reports are developed. Among the reports are the Attrition Report, the Freshman Demographic Report, the Educational Outcome Report, the Occupational Survey Report, and the Study of Alumni Report. These reports are distributed among the administrators. Further, it was stated that the reports are not made public because of the pilot nature of the existing system. The Educational Outcome Survey and the Occupational Survey were part of a NCHEMS pilot study. There are future plans, however, to utilize questionnaires specifically developed for the University of Colorado. The resources available at this time for the student follow-ups are taken from the existing institutional research budget and commitment. It was stated that much of the activity for this effort has come as overload to the staff. When asked what the future directions were, it was stated that there is a need to develop other pilot instruments and to find out the needs of the administrators. When asked if they would be willing to cooperate in the development of an uniform system, they stated that in

working with NCHEMS they had found it not beneficial to the campus to be tied to an uniform system. There was also some concern expressed about who would get the data. It was stated that the institution would share existing data related to manpower supply concerns, but they felt that the program evaluation data was confidential and should not be disseminated beyond the campus. At this point in the development of the Boulder campus system, it was apparent that a strong effort is being made to clean up their own processing system. The burden of cooperation and redevelopment would require more resources than the institution could commit at this time.

A second interview was conducted with the Director of Career Placement and Counseling. This office has the responsibilities of doing a wage and salary survey, in cooperation with the College Placement Council. The purpose of this survey is to provide some information pertaining to success of the current placement program. Each year the information is used for a comprehensive evaluation report for the president. This report takes various forms. The 1978-79 report was concerned with services provided to current students. The only individuals involved in the survey were those utilizing the Placement or Career Counseling services. Also, information concerned with jobs and relevant salary information is collected at the point of graduation. A comprehensive study of individuals using services and not using services was performed, so as to justify the effectiveness of the placement services provided. The types of reports developed are a Placement Summary Report that is provided to the administration and the Salary and Wage Report which is provided to those individuals requesting average salary and wage information. It was stated that most follow-ups were completed by the Institutional Research Office, and the Placement Office efforts to do graduate follow-up was limited. The data presently

used is being analyzed by hand. The Placement Office would be willing to share the existing data with SOICC but would not commit additional resourses to student follow-up. The following may be found in the Technical Appendix: 1) Employee and employer placement salary survey forms, cover letters and reports of the surveys 2) From the Department of Institutional Research: a) Graduating student survey b) Existing student survey c) Alumni survey d) Freshman questionnaire.

Metro State College

The Associate Vice President for Institutional Research was interviewed at Metro State College. Metro State has a systematic approach to student follow-up; this approach was part of a comprehensive student based evaluation system. This system had, as primary objectives, to provide the central administration with program review data and to supply data for state required reports.

The system included a follow-up of drop-outs, and the Withdrawal Questionnaire had a primary purpose of identifying the reason why students withdraw from college. Other segments of the data collection system dealt with current student information and demographic information. It was further stated that the composite of all surveys serves as a tool for program improvement. Students were kept track of through the Student Data Base. This data base was shared by the Registrar's Office, Admissions Office, and other institutional departments. It was stated that there was some problem in identifying current addresses for the alumni follow-up. The information collected about recent alumni and non-returing students was identified by majors. These majors were coded with an institutional code. It was stated that it would be possible to transpose the institutional code into a Hegis code if needed. The institution presently does a one and five year follow-up utilizing the same instrument. Last year 69% of the alumni surveyed returned questionnaires; 40% of the non-returning students responded to the follow-up. Information was collected on both

instruments pertaining to job placement; these jobs were coded using a three digit Metro State code.

This follow-up system, as it stands, was developed basically by Metro State and utilizes, to a small extent, the NCHEMS materials. The geographic location of graduates could be pin-pointed through the use of the return address request. There was no employer follow-up conducted by the central administration; however, it was noted that some departments do follow-ups with employers concerning their graduates. It was stated that the data collected are processed utilizing the SPSS Programming, and that a number of reports are developed from the data. Among the reports is the Objective Summary, which is distributed to the deans, vice presidents, and president. It is also made available to any other interested person. Secondly, a supplemental report by major for the nine schools or centers within Metro State is developed. This report breaks out the information by center or department. Thirdly, the raw data is presented to the Outcome Advisory Committee, a committee made up of faculty members. Further, the information is made part of the Facts Book report. A final use of the data is its inclusion in the Question and Answer Book, which contains many of the common questions asked of the administration with appropriate data for that question. This system requires utilization of one full time staff member titled Director of Outcome Assessment, a secretary, and various work-study individuals. Also, computer and mailing budgets are available.

At this time it is seen that only slight modifications will be made in the system; there may be some slight changes to improve the readibility of the questionnaire.

When asked if the Metro State representatives would be interested in cooperating with SOICC in developing an uniform system, the answer was

"probably not". This was qualified in that Metro State had spent much time and resources in developing a system that meets their needs, and any joint effort was seen as requiring redevelopment and an expenditure of a great deal of resources that could be used for other things. Also, it was noted any uniform system must be cognizant of political considerations. It was stated, however, that Metro State would be willing to supply names and addresses of graduates and would share existing data with SOICC, if permission was obtained from the President. All other resource commitments would be contingent upon whether the system were equal to or better than the one Metro State presently has in effect. To support their existing system and also contribute extensively to a parallel system is not seen as viable. Copies of the Alumni questionnaire and the non-returning student questionnaire may be found in the Technical Appendix.

University of Northern Colorado

Six individuals were interviewed at the University of Northern Colorado: the Placement Director, the Director of the Bureau of Research, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Evaluation, the Associate Dean of the Graduate School, the Chairman of the Recreation and Gerontology Department and the Chairperson of the Department of Home Economics. There were approximately 34 departments that were identified as doing some type of student follow-up study - - from formal to very informal. The interviewer could not possibly collect information from all departments; therefore, two were selected, based upon the types of follow-up procedures used, and the remaining departments were seen as being represented by these two. Further, the researcher checked with several department chairpersons by phone to verify the kinds of activities in which the departments were involved. Also, the researcher contacted Dick Wood, the Director of the Center for Special and Advanced Programs. It was found that the Center had

conducted student follow-ups in the past but presently was not involved in a follow-up and had no immediate plans to reinstitute such a procedure. It was noted by several of those interviewed that the University has instituted some discussions concerning the unification of the student follow-up process. However, it should be noted that little progress has been made in this unification effort. It was found that the University has two systematic efforts for following-up students. The first is the one managed by the Placement Center. The Placement Center systematically follows up each graduate at the end of each school year. This information is collected to establish the institution's success in placement and to provide information to the central administration for completion of reports required by state and federal agencies. Names and addresses are obtained from the current Placement Office files or from the latest address on file with the Registrar's office. The questionnaire used collects information about majors but does not code majors. The percent of return for last year's questionnaire was 49.3%. The questionnaire does ask for information pertaining to job title; however, this information is not coded. The system presently in use was developed by the staff of the Placement Office and has been changed yearly to improve the response rate and the accuracy of the data. It should be noted that the Placement Office feels very confident in their information, stating that it is reliable and valid; they further feel that their survey serves a useful purpose. The information collected only includes "in-state" and "out-of-state" geographic identification. The data once collected is processed by hand. One report is developed and is disseminated to the president, the deans, and the department chairpersons. A summary of the report is released to the news media. The major information reported is percentage of graduates employed by department.

When asked about the types of resources utilized, it was stated that the survey followed up approximately 4,000 students last year. The Placement Director utilizes one graduate assistant and staff time as the major resource committment. Other resources committed are printing cost and mailing cost. The follow-up is begun the first of October every year; those included in the survey are all graduates, Fall through Summer of the preceding year. Further, the Placement Office does one or two additional mailings of the follow-up questionnaire in an effort to solicit information from non-respondents. This last year the Placement Office did a non-respondent survey to try to identify the types of biases non-respondents may have.

It is seen by the Placement Office that the questionnaire and procedures are pretty well defined, and there is no apparent need for major changes. When asked about their willingness to cooperate in a generalizable and uniform system, the answer was yes, but the system must not have a long questionnaire, and the system must get, at least, the same percent of return as they presently get. It has been their experience that the longer the questionnaire, the lower the return rates, and, consequently, their post card sized instrument is used. There was some concern expressed about transferring the management of a student follow-up system, in that the quality of the information received might not be as high. Any report must have this information presented in a fashion where it could be broken out, similar to the types of reports presently generated by UNC. With these reservations, it was noted that the Placement Center would cooperate by supplying names and addresses of graduates, by supplying clerical assistance for coding instruments to the extent that it is presently used, and by sharing existing data. However, it was felt any

additional resources committed to such a project would have to be approved by the central administration. The bottom line is that the Placement Bureau would be interested in cooperating if the data is still valid, reliable, and creditable, and if they can get what information they need for their current report. It was also stated that any cooperation cannot cost more than what it costs them now for obtaining the data.

The Graduate School does an annual follow-up of all Master's and Doctoral candidates. The purpose of this report is to provide the departments with program evaluation data and to provide information for program planning. There is no specific emphasis on placement information. The Graduate School asks the students to respond to a questionnaire upon exiting from the program. Master's degree students are mailed their questionnaire through addresses obtained from the alumni association. Majors are identified for all graduate students. The follow-ups are done quarterly, and on an informal basis a sample of students are taken for extended follow-up. Basically, eight questions are addressed to students in an open-ended format, along with ratings of low to high. The graduate office receives approximately 60% return on both the master's and doctor's survey. They collect no information related to job placement. Again, the Graduate Dean emphasized the need for a short, concise questionnaire, and their criterion is to keep the questionnaire to one side of one page. The Graduate Office does some employer follow-ups in the Doctor of Arts degree program. This program has graduated 60 to 70 students over the past seven years, and each graduate has been followed up by means of a personal letter from the president of UNC to the president of the institution which employed the graduate. The responses to the letters are on file. Again, there is no reference to job title, and the

purpose for this follow-up is for program improvement. The questionnaires are each read by the Graduate Dean and the Associate Dean. These questionnaires, together with pertinent comments pertaining to departments, schools, colleges, the Vice President of Academic Affiars or particular faculty members are copied and sent to the individuals concerned. It was noted that ad hoc reports are generated upon request by specific individuals. These reports are always focused upon program improvement. Also, a secondary result of the survey is faculty improvement. Resources utilized to complete the survey are part of the total operation of the Graduate School. The time necessary for the Dean and the Associate Dean to read the questionnaire is the major contribution in terms of cost. The Graduate School presently plans to extend their follow-up effort by doing three to five year follow-ups. These surveys again will be concerned with program quality; also, a random selection of employers may be followed-up in the near future to collect data concerning program improvement. It was felt by the Associate Dean of the Graduate School that the intent of their questionnaire was such that a generalizable, uniform system probably would not meet their needs. However, the Graduate School Dean said that they would cooperate with SOICC by supplying names and addresses of graduates and by processing a standardized questionnaire if it met their needs. The following may be found in the Technical Appendix: 1) Outreach, graduate follow-up questionnaire 2) College of Education, graduate follow-up questionnaire 3) Placement, graduate follow-up questionnaire and report of findings 4) Graduate School, alumni questionnaire.

Summary

In summarizing the interviews, Table 1 was developed to provide the reader with an overview of the results of the survey. The summary is written to address the main purposes of the study as listed in the proposal.

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF STUDENT FOLLOW SYSTEM

COLLEGES	Systematic Student Follow Up	Commitment To Student Follow Up	RANKED MAJOR PURPOSES OF FOLLOW UP						Collect College Major	Employer Follow Up	Collect Job Title Information	Interested In Cooperative Development Of Student Follow Up	INTEREST IN COOPERATING WITH SOICC					
			Identify Why Student Withdrew	Supply Data For State & Federal Reports	Program Evaluation	Central Admin. Program Review	Estab. Job Placement Success	Manpower Projection					Set Aside Funds For Follow Up	Supply Name & Address To SOICC	Provide Some Clerical Assist.	Process Standardized Questionnaire	Share Existing Data	Provide Technical Expertise
ADAMS STATE	YES	YES		Third	Fourth	Sec.	First		YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
CSU	NO	YES[2]			First							YES[3]		Might[7]				
FORT LEWIS	NO	YES										YES[4]		YES[7]				
MESA COLLEGE	YES	YES		First	Sec.	Third			YES	NO	YES	YES[4]		YES			YES	
METRO STATE COLLEGE	YES	YES	Sec.	First	Sec.	First	Sec.		YES	NO	YES	NO		YES			YES	
SCHOOL OF MINES	NO	NO										NO		YES[8]				
U OF C/BOULDER	YES	YES	Sec.		Third	First			YES	NO	YES	NO					YES[6]	
U OF C/COLO. SPGS.	NO	YES					First					YES		YES	YES		YES	YES
U OF C/DENVER	YES	YES			First	First	First		YES	YES	YES	YES[4]	A Little	NO	YES		YES	
UNI. OF DENVER	NO	YES			First							YES						
UNC	YES	YES		Sec.	Third		First		YES	NO	YES	YES[1]		YES	YES		YES[2]	
USC	NO	YES[5]			First							YES[3]		Might[7]				
WESTERN ST. COLLEGE	YES	YES		Sec.		Fourth	First	Third	YES	NO	YES	YES		YES	YES		YES	

1 - Working On Unifying In-House Follow Up Procedures.
2 - Will Share Reports.
3 - Not Interested In Centralized System.
4 - If It Meets Our Needs.
5 - Only If Decentralized.
6 - Manpower Related Data Only.
7 - Need Individual Student's Permission.
8 - Buy From Alumni Association.

These are:

1. What types of follow-up systems are used in higher education in Colorado?

2. To what extent are institutions of higher education committed to the concept of graduate follow-up?

3. What is the future direction of graduate follow-up for institutions in Colorado?

4. To what extent can the data currently being collected by institutions of higher education be used to enhance the supply data compiled by SOICC?

5. To what extent would a centralized, uniform graduate follow-up system be helpful to the institutions of higher education in Colorado?

The summary will briefly address each of these questions in a general fashion and, hopefully, provide some insight for the reader into the present status of and future developments for student follow-up in institutions of higher education in Colorado. Second, recommendations for consideration by SOICC will be provided.

Types of Systems

There are three basic types of systems identified through the follow-up study. First and most useful were the follow-up systems developed by the Institutional Research or Placement Division that collected information pertaining to occupational title and student major. The most sophisticated of these systems were at Metro State and the University of Colorado at Boulder. Other systems that would appear to meet the needs of SOICC are those at the University of Northern Colorado, Adams State College, Mesa College, the University of Southern Colorado, and Western State College. The second type of student follow-up was the follow-up completed by departments and schools that primarily impacted on program improvement and program evaluation. These surveys were completed on a less regular basis and with smaller groups of students. It would appear that the information

from this type of survey would not be useful to SOICC. Colleges having these types of follow-ups are Colorado State University and the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. A third type of follow-up study was the ad hoc studies completed by institutions such as Ft. Lewis College and the University of Colorado at Denver. It would appear that the information from these surveys might be helpful to the SOICC; however, because the information is only collected on an ad hoc basis, that is, on a three, four or five year cycle, its use would be extremely limited in that it would only apply accurately to one year.

Commitment to Graduate Follow-up

Twelve of the thirteen institutions involved in the study appeared to have some commitment to graduate follow-up. The level of commitment varied greatly from Metro State College, which has a full time professional position allocation for Outcome Assessment, of which student follow-ups is a portion, to Ft. Lewis College, where student follow-up is an extra task for an already busy administrator to do if he has time.

Future Direction

Various institutions had future plans for improving their student follow-up procedures. Most institutions saw a need for collecting student follow-up data. The types of commitments made to future plans were not large scoped. Several institutions were thinking about modifying the questionnaire they used; others were thinking about developing computer programming for analyzing their data; and a few were still in the developmental stages of their system and would be doing extensive modification if the need arises.

Enhancement of Supply Data

It is seen that those surveys that collect occupational title information and provide majors could be utilized to enhance the supply data developed by SOICC. The questionnaires utilized by various institutions are available as a Technical Appendix to the report. The specific type of data element can be analyzed from the questionnaire and judgments made concerning the appropriateness of each school's data for the SOICC matrix. Further, all teacher education follow-up is done by the State Department of Education, (SDE) and this data could be used for supply information. The current SDE questionnaire and summary report are also included in the Technical Appendix.

Development of a Generalizable System

Ten of the thirteen institutions involved in the survey would, to some extent, be interested in cooperating with SOICC in the development of a generalizable system. The major caveat to their commitment is that the system must meet the institutions' needs. Two of the institutions that felt that they would not cooperate at this time with SOICC in the development of a generalizable system are institutions that have extremely complex and sophisticated student follow-up procedures, and both institutions have tried to work jointly with NCHEMS in the development of their follow-up system without success. Both institutions stated that f[illegible] their experience they felt that they should go it alone. If SOICC wished to do a student follow-up of its own, eight of the thirteen colleges and universities would supply names and addresses of graduates for that follow-up. Six institutions would provide clerical assistance for mailing and coding instruments. Two institutions stated that they would process standardized questionnaires, and nine institutions stated that they would share existing data. There were some reservations in terms of the types of data to be shared, but

every institution said that they would share the occupational title and major infomation. Some would only share this in aggregate form. Three institutions stated that they would provide technical expertise to what extent it was available at their institutions for the management of a generalizable system.

Recommendations

It is the recommendation of the evaluator that any system being propose provide for:

1) Centralized processing of the data.

2) Decentralized data collection.

3) A short, concise instrument that provides adequate opportunity for local institutions, departments and schools to include their own questions.

4) Some guarantee against the misuse of the information by other agencies and/or legislators.

Further work that could be done to bring institutional information into the SOICC supply matrix includes:

1) Review the present questionnaires and obtain that data pertaining to the supply matrix that has been offered. Institutions that appear to have data are Metro State College, the University of Colorado at Boulder, the University of Northern Colorado, Mesa College, Western State College, Adams State College and the University of Southern Colorado.

2) Provide a forum so that each school or college interested in being involved in a student follow-up system can discuss concerns, needs and desires for student follow-up with the SOICC Director and with their counterparts from the other institutions.

3) Provide technical consultant help to institutions wishing to develop their own student follow-up system with the understanding that the occupational information needed by SOICC will be included as part of the questionnaire and shared with SOICC once collected.

4) Do a follow-up study of graduates from the University of Colorado at Denver, the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, Colorado School of Mines and possibly Colorado State University to provide adequate supply data for SOICC.

5) Explore further with Ft. Lewis College and Denver University the best method of obtaining student follow-up data for their graduates.

The survey has established that there is extensive follow-up being done at various institutions. The follow-ups are not always systematic and do not always collect the kinds of information that is needed by SOICC, but there is a commitment to follow-up by the institutions and, for the most part, a commitment has been made to share existing data and to cooperate further with SOICC in providing information needed for the SOICC supply matrix.

SURVEY OF FOUR-YEAR POST SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

SAY:

The purpose of this survey is to identify the types of student follow-up completed by your institution. Although the survey is structured, this should not prevent you from providing additional input related to the survey topic.

COMPLETE:

Institution _____ Interviwer _____

Date _____

ASK:

1. Do you currently have in place a systematic graduate follow-up system?

if NO: go to page 5 .

If YES: 1) Who is responsible for administrating the follow-up study (ask where department fits into the system) _____

_____

_____

2) Does the system utilize the data collected by professional Societies? If yes, which ones? _____

_____

_____

2. Rank the following major purposes of your student follow-up system.

____ a) To identify why students withdraw from college.

____ b) To supply data for State required reports.

____ c) To provide departments with program evaluation data.

____ d) To provide the central administration with program review data.

____ e) To establish the institution's success in job placement.

____ f) To address local program planning.

____ g) To provide job and manpower projections.

Give interviewee card with items to rank.

3. How do you keep track of graduates addresses? _____

_____

a) What students do you follow-up?
(Majors) (as sample) _____

b) How are Majors coded (HEGIS?) _____

c) Is the follow-up a recurring committment of your institution? _____

If YES ask:

Do you do a 1, 3, 5, and/or other year follow-up? _____

_____

d) What percent of returns did you get last year? _____

e) Do you collect information related to job placement? _____

If YES: How do you code this information (DOT, SOC, etc.) _____

_____

f) Did you adopt your current graduate follow-up system from another established system or was it developed for this institution? _____

_____

g) How do you identify Geographical location of graduates? (get geographical breakdown)

_____

Do you do an Employer follow-up? _____

If YES: What types of information do you collect? _____

_____

_____

Get a copy of the instrument. Get all the written information available.

Could I have a copy of the instruments you use and any write-up on the system and report formats?

REPORTING:

1) How is the follow-up data processed (computer, by hand) _____

_____

2) What types of reports are developed from the follow-up data, and who receives copies of the reports?

Type of report	Who
a)	
b)	
c)	
d)	
e)	

FOR EACH REPORT ASK:

3) What is the purpose of this (specify report's name) report?

Report 1: _____

_____

_____

Report 2: _____

_____

_____

Report 3: _____

_____

_____

Report 4: _____

_____

_____

Report 5: _____

_____

_____

4) What decisions have been made based upon this report?

Report a: _____

_____

_____

Report b: _____

_____

_____

Report c: _____

_____

_____

Report d: _____

_____

_____

Report e: _____

_____

_____

5) What types of resources are used to complete the follow-up study (ies)? (funds, people, etc.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

Skip to FUTURE DIRECTIONS section.

QUESTIONS FOR INDIVIDUALS NOT HAVING A FOLLOW-UP SYSTEM

If no: from page 1, then ask:

1) What type of student follow-up has been done?

   a) use of professional societies follow-up information? _____

   _____

   b) individual efforts by various departments? etc.? _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

2) Where is the data collected/distributed? _____

   _____

3) What are the purposes of these follow-ups? _____

   _____

4) Is occupational title information collected as part of the data?

   _____

   (e.g. not organizational titles, but occupational titles such as economist, real estate salesperson, civil engineer, etc.)

ASK: May I talk with an individual directing one of these follow-ups? (Get them to make an appointment for you.)

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

1) Do you have plans for revising your present mode of student follow-up?

If YES, then ask:

In What Areas:

[Format of questionnaire _____ include more students _____

administration of follow-up _____ types of reports _____

distribution of data _____ evaluation of resources _____

Others _____]

Write Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2) Would you be willing to use a more generalizable and uniform system that would furnish your school with more data on your graduates and dropouts and also furnish occupational supply data to SOICC? [Why or why not]

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3) Would you be willing to cooperate with SOICC or the Commission in doing a systematic student follow-up?

If YES, in what way?

____a) set aside funding for this purpose

____b) supply names and addresses of graduates

____c) clerical assistance in making and coding instruments

____d) process standardized questionnaire returns

____e) share existing data

____f) provide technical expertise to manage follow-up

____g) Other: _____

_____

_____